

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 11, 13, 15, and 30 have been amended. Support for the added recitations is found in the original application, in particular Figures 23-25 and corresponding description.

In addition, new claim 55 has been added. Support for claim 55 is also found in the original application, in particular on page 9, lines 25-26 of the description and Figures 2, 5 and 6.

Claims 5-7, 10-15, 17, 20-21, 24, 26, 28-34, 36, 38-40, 42-44 and 46-55 are pending in the present application. The claims are directed to a liquid crystal display device.

In the Office Action, claims 5, 10 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description. It is alleged in the Office Action that the phrase “no polarizer being provided between the second substrate and the white diffusing film” in claims 5, 10 and 34 is new matter.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the original application clearly and explicitly discloses to a person of ordinary skill in the art an embodiment of the invention having no polarizer between the second substrate and the white diffusing film.

Specifically, the feature of no polarizer between the white diffusing film and the second substrate is immediately derived from the statements on page 7, lines 21-22 of the specification (“a white diffusing film, a polarizing film and a reflector may be disposed in that order on the outer face of the second substrate”) and on page 17, lines 19-20 of the specification (“a polarizing film is not provided on the second substrate”), in conjunction with Figures 2, 5, and 6.

In particular, reference is made to the embodiment of Figs. 2 and 5 which has a white diffusing film 22 between the liquid crystal cell substrate 2 and a polarizer 21B and/or reflector 25, whereas the embodiment of Fig. 24 (18th embodiment) has a polarizer 21B between the liquid crystal cell substrate 2 and a diffusing film 22. The specification teaches at page 14, lines 5-6: "In the first embodiment of the invention, a white diffusing film 22 is disposed between the second substrate 2 and the polarizing film 21B," and at page 50, lines 13-16: "The eighteenth embodiment differs from the first embodiment only in that a polarizing film 21B, a white diffusing film 22 and a reflector 25 are provided in that order on the outer face of the second substrate 2." The difference between the two embodiments is summarized as follows: "changing of places between the white diffusing film 22 and the polarizing film 21B takes place." This sentence would make no sense if a polarizer remained in front of the diffusing film in the first embodiment. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that no polarizer is disposed between the white diffusing film and the second substrate.

It is submitted that MPEP 2173.05(i), which is referred to in the Office Action, states: "If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims." In the present application, the presence of a polarizer on one side of the diffuser and the absence of polarizer on the other side are clearly disclosed as alternative embodiments.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection for lack of written description should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, the following rejections are made:

- claims 5, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by US 6,124,905 to Iijima (Iijima);
- claims 6, 12, 17, 20-22, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iijima;
- claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iijima in view of JP 10-239683 (Hiroshi);
- claims 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iijima in view of JP 08-146207 (Hirozo);
- claims 40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iijima in view of US 6,175,399; and
- claims 13, 15 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Iijima.

The rejected independent claims are 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 30 and 34.

Claims 5, 10 and 34 (and presently added claim 55)

In the Office Action, the rejection over Iijima is maintained because the feature of no polarizer between the white diffusing film and the second substrate is not taken into account.

The rejection of these claims over Iijima is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the absence of polarizer between the second substrate and the white diffusing film is fully supported in the original application as discussed above, and that this feature is not taught or suggested in Iijima. Therefore, present claims 5, 10 and 34 are not anticipated by, and not obvious over, Iijima.

In addition, with respect to presently added claim 55, it is submitted that the features recited in claim 55 are also fully supported in the original application and not taught or suggested in Iijima. Therefore, present claim 55 is also not obvious over Iijima.

Claim 11

It is alleged in the Office Action that a person of ordinary skill in the art would add a diffusing film in front of the liquid crystal cell, as taught in Hiroshi, in the display of Iijima.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Hiroshi fails to teach or suggest a diffusing film in direct contact with the substrate. In particular, Hiroshi teaches that a retardation film 4 is disposed between the substrate 7 and the diffusing film 5, as shown on Figure 1. This construction is supposed to be preferable in Hiroshi.

In contrast, an advantage of the construction of the present invention with the diffusing film in direct contact with the substrate, as recited in present claim 11, is that it is possible to reduce or prevent reflection at the interface, as discussed on page 49, lines 11-12 of the present specification. This feature of the presently claimed invention is not taught in Hiroshi and Iijima, and therefore, present claim 11 is not obvious over Hiroshi and Iijima taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 13, 15 and 30:

In the Office Action, it is alleged that "Iijima teaches a number of embodiments that would have rendered the claimed invention obvious."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Iijima fails to teach or disclose a diffusing film in direct contact with the polarizing film. In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the diffusing film in direct contact with the polarizing film, as recited

in present claims 13, 15, and 30, makes it possible to reduce or prevent reflection at the interface. This feature and its advantages are not taught or suggested in Iijima, and therefore, present claims 13, 15 and 30 are not obvious over Iijima taken alone or in any combination with the other cited references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the prior art rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.


Serial Number: 09/582,474

Group Art Unit: 2871

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP

By: 
Nicolas E. Seckel *Reg. No. 32,878*
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 000759

Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: (202) 659-2930
Fax: (202) 887-0357
NES:rep:ya

Encl.: Petition for One-Month Extension of Time